

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5225

Federal loans to student borrowers, to the general guidelines set forth by the report of the Committee on Federal credit programs approved by President Kennedy last year. Student loans under the expanded National Defense Education Act program, as proposed by S. 580 and S. 2490, would continue to be provided through participating institutions at a fixed 3-percent rate, following the terms of legislation enacted in 1958. The Committee on Federal credit programs concluded that in general fixed rates of interest introduced an arbitrary element of rigidity into the administration of direct lending programs, tending to obscure the proper evaluation of their cost in relation to benefits and to provide varying amounts of subsidy over time in relation to prevailing costs and market rates.

Instead of such fixed rates, the committee suggested, among its guidelines, that the practice generally be followed, when establishing new programs or making substantial changes in existing programs, of relating the rate charged to current yields on Treasury securities of comparable maturity. That practice is incorporated in the direct loan program for medical and dental students introduced last year and in the similar program for student nurses presently proposed, as well as in credit programs in a variety of other areas.

This Department does not feel that application of this concept would be appropriate at this time at the expense of delaying consideration of the present proposals for simply extending a successfully operating program. Rather, exploration of the feasibility and desirability of a change in this respect could be adequately considered and studied only in relation to other administrative arrangements in the National Defense Education Act program, which has successfully developed and functioned through large numbers of institutions administering what are, in effect, separate loan programs on the basis of Federal capital contributions. At this time, we simply wish to make note of the relevance of this matter when substantive changes in the program might be under consideration in the continuing effort to assure maximum effectiveness of the National Defense Education Act program. In setting forth this matter for consideration at an appropriate time, we should also make clear that we are not suggesting that the Government should not properly absorb whatever portion of the interest and other costs may be appropriate to assure effective accomplishment of the objectives of the student loan program.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for being so kind and courteous as to yield to me.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming, with the understanding that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

ED MURROW'S SERVICE WITH USIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is a very illuminating experience for an American overseas to discover what sort of opinions the people of the country he is in have of America. The subject takes on added importance when we realize

that the American image goes hand in hand with American success or lack of it in our relations with the rest of the world.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that much more of the world now appreciates and understands the real America than ever before. The all but universal expressions of personal loss following President Kennedy's death are a moving tribute to that fact. And no one man is more responsible for that new understanding than Edward R. Murrow, the recently retired Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. President, the story of Ed Murrow's service as the voice of this Nation overseas is well documented in an article which appeared in the Washington Post for March 15. I ask unanimous consent that this article by Jean White be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUSTER RUBBED OFF ON USIA—ED MURROW'S VERY PRESENCE GAVE OUR WORLD "VOICE" NEW STATURE

(By Jean White)

When he came to Washington as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Edward R. Murrow brought along a reputation for courage, integrity, and intelligence as a news commentator.

It is perhaps a measure of Murrow's success in the post that his personal reputation did not shrink in 34 months in a Government job. If anything, some of his prestige and luster rubbed off on the USIA.

The USIA directorship has not been exactly a reputation builder. In little more than two decades, the agency has had five names and a dozen Directors. It is a sitting target for congressional critics who don't like an abstract painting sent overseas or a certain paragraph amid millions of words published.

Since the USIA can't tell its story at home, the American public usually hears about the agency only when it has made a big mistake. It has no lobby to press Congress for funds. Its product is for export only. It deals in intangibles, and the results can't be summed up in a graph for an annual report.

BEYOND ARITHMETIC

Murrow himself put it this way a year ago: "But it is very difficult to measure success in our business. No computer clicks, no cash register rings when a man changes his mind or opts for freedom."

It is almost as difficult to measure the success of Murrow's USIA stewardship from early 1961 until he resigned in January to recuperate from an operation for lung cancer.

He did noticeably improve the product, particularly in the mass media fields of films and television programs. The Voice of America doubled its power and the USIA beefed up its programs in the key areas of Latin America and Africa.

But more important, if less tangible, may have been the effect of Murrow's presence. The respected news broadcaster gave the USIA stature with Congress and the public at home. This, in turn, gave more self-respect to the staff, which had never completely recovered from the demoralizing attacks of the McCarthy era. An acclaimed professional, Murrow began to attract bright young recruits to the USIA.

Murrow became the most influential USIA Director since the World War II days of Elmer Davis and the predecessor Office of War Information. He sat in on policy decisions, had a direct telephone (the "blowtorch") to the President and often dashed the two blocks

down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. He became the President's adviser on psychological factors in the formulation and execution of foreign policy.

A perfectionist, Murrow probably didn't shake up the USIA as much as he wanted to. It is a vast operation, with nearly 13,000 employees in 106 countries. Inspiration can filter down through only so many layers of bureaucracy.

He had his frustrations as USIA Director. He tangled with Congress over budget cuts and "shoestring financing." He didn't attract as many top-talent people as he had hoped.

"But he left a better agency than he found, and it will be still better 5 or 10 years from now because of Murrow's work," one of his aids summed up Murrow's tenure.

NINETY-PERCENT PAY CUT

Thomas C. Sorensen, a career man with 18½ years with the USIA, is Deputy Director in charge of policy and plans. Until Murrow took over, the USIA had no clearly defined role or direction, he feels.

"For the first time, under President Kennedy and Murrow we had a clear mandate of what role the President wanted us to play in foreign affairs. And we were allowed and encouraged to play that role to the fullest," he says.

Murrow took the USIA job (at a 90-percent pay cut from an estimated \$200,000 at CBS to a \$21,000 Government salary) on the condition that he would have his say in making the policies that the USIA later would have to explain to the world. He wanted to do more than pick up the pieces after a fiasco. President Kennedy agreed, and Murrow became the first USIA Director to sit on the National Security Council.

As Murrow defined it, the job of the USIA is to make the policy and actions of the United States "intelligible and, whenever possible, palatable." He operated the Agency on the philosophy that truth is the best propaganda, even when it hurts.

The USIA has reported the story of racial violence in the United States in the larger context of a democracy working out its problems. As might be expected, this approach drew congressional criticism. Some Senators asked Murrow whether it was wise to show weaknesses.

"We cannot be effective in telling the American story abroad if we tell it only in superlatives," he replied.

A NUCLEAR ROLE

On the policymaking level, the USIA played a key role in the timing of the resumption of U.S. nuclear testing in 1961. Murrow asked for as much time as possible to capitalize on the moratorium break by the Russians. The USIA also wanted a chance to explain why the United States was forced to resume tests itself.

During the 1962 Cuban crisis, the USIA saturated communications channels with messages documenting the American position. In a single week, 50,000 pictures of the Russian missile sites were air expressed overseas.

The USIA even drew blood from the Communists. Last June, the Moscow radio accused the Agency of provoking sleepless nights in socialist countries.

As USIA Director, Murrow was in command of a vast operation using seven media of communication: radio, television, movies, press, books, exhibits and the arts. Some 600 million persons see USIA documentary films each month. The Agency places 500 TV programs each year in more than 60 countries.

Its wireless news file carries 10,000 words daily and it publishes nearly 70 magazines and some 20 newspapers. There are more than 180 USIA libraries. The Voice of America broadcasts 789 hours a week in 36 languages.

THE LAST 3 FEET

The USIA has nearly 1,500 officers at posts overseas, and Murrow cut down their paperwork and told them to wear out shoe leather rather than typewriter ribbon.

"I once heard him tell a group of staffers that it was no miracle of communication to send a message by Telstar," an aid recalls. "He said it was the last 3 feet between one man and another that matters in getting a message across."

All was not sweetness and light for Murrow and the USIA. He had to fight budget cuts. He lashed out at Congress for a \$15 million cut last year.

"We are being outspent, outpublished, and outbroadcast," he said in a speech. "We are a first-rate power. We must speak with a first-rate voice abroad."

Murrow had his faults and made mistakes. He didn't like administrative work but he tried to learn all phases of the USIA operation. He did his homework for congressional testimony and sat through all the hearings rather than just making an appearance.

The 55-year-old Murrow often joked about being the old man of what he called the New Zealand administration, but he set a pace with a 15-hour day. He told a friend: "I have never worked harder in my life and never been happier." I haven't had such satisfaction since the days of covering the London blitz."

A MORE FLEXIBLE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has again demonstrated his ability as a perceptive analyst of foreign events and the complex world which we inhabit today.

In an interview published yesterday in the Washington Star the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has performed a significant service in setting a critical foreign policy question in proper perspective and setting before the American public the stakes in this matter and what are some of the alternatives we face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that interview be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 15, 1964]

ON THE RECORD: MORE FLEXIBLE FOREIGN POLICY?

(Following is the transcript of an "On-the-Record" interview with Senator CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho)

Question. Senator CHURCH, the Republicans say that foreign policy will be the major issue in the coming presidential campaign. Do you accept that premise and, as a Democrat, how do you feel about it?

Answer. I think that foreign policy, in the times in which we live, will always be a major issue in a national election campaign.

As a Democrat, I welcome it. I think that the foreign policy record of President Kennedy and President Johnson is strong, and that this issue will be to our advantage.

Question. The most serious problem right now is probably Vietnam. Would you be willing to see a full-scale American debate on what course we should take in Vietnam?

Answer. Yes, if there are real alternatives to discuss. Should the President propose some change of course in South Vietnam, this would provide an occasion for extended debate. If, on the other hand, we continue to hold to our present policy, then I would not anticipate such a debate soon taking place.

Question. Do you think it was right for the United States to become so deeply committed to its present course in Vietnam, without a debate in Congress or among the general public?

Answer. I personally have always had grave misgivings over the original decision which took us into South Vietnam. If we had it to do again, I would strenuously object, and I know there are many others who would, also.

Unfortunately, neither President Kennedy nor President Johnson had that option available to them. We were in Vietnam when they took over.

SUCCESS IN VIETNAM?

Question. Is it your own view that we are succeeding, or failing, now, in Vietnam?

Answer. I don't know. I am not optimistic about the outlook. If Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, is regarded by by most Vietnamese people, North and South, as the authentic architect of independence from the French, as the George Washington of Vietnam, so to speak, it will be hard for us. Wars against George Washingtons are not easily won.

Question. Do you think that the way out in Vietnam may be to carry the war north into North Vietnam, or even Red China?

Answer. That is certainly not the way out. As I look at the map, that is the way in.

I would hope that we don't make South Vietnam a launching pad for another Korean war. That war cost us heavily in American lives and fortune. We were able to end the fighting only by confining ourselves to the area south of the 38th parallel. This became the basis for the truce, but the Korean problem is still costing us half a billion a year.

One could question what has been gained, when one compares the enormous outpouring of American resources into this Korean peninsula with the real interests of the United States that have been served by our presence there.

Are we again to repeat this performance in South Vietnam, extending the war northward, inviting the Chinese down? I would have to be persuaded that the vital interests of the United States are in fact at stake, to warrant so dangerous and endless an adventure as this would be.

We need to look further ahead than our immediate frustrations in South Vietnam. If we were to make this our own war and occupy this territory with the American Army, which would be the likely next step if the war were broadened, then we must face up to the fact that we will have to seize and hold this remote region of the world with naked American power. Asiatic people would regard our holding it as a kind of American possession, however differently we viewed it.

Everything that has happened in the last 20 years demonstrates the folly of such a course.

SOUTHEAST ASIA SETTLEMENT

Question. Do you see merit in President de Gaulle's suggestion of a neutralist settlement in Southeast Asia?

Answer. If the whole of the archipelago could be neutralized, including North Vietnam, then I should think that this would be positively in the American interest, as well as in the general interest of all the peoples concerned.

I am not dismayed that General de Gaulle is apparently attempting to explore the possibilities for some such political settlement. If he succeeds, it could well serve our interest and furnish us with a basis for an acceptable solution. If he fails, we are no worse off for his having tried.

Question. Do you think, then, that we should officially support General de Gaulle's search for a neutralist solution in southeast Asia?

Answer. I think that President de Gaulle does not particularly want our support.

Therefore, I see no advantage to be gained by giving him our official endorsement.

Question. There is another option we haven't discussed. Would this be a problem that the United Nations could deal with effectively?

Answer. It might be. But only if some possibility develops for neutralizing the whole of the archipelago. It is difficult for me to conceive how the United Nations could play a useful role here, if the only issue is what shall be done about South Vietnam.

PRESIDENT'S ROLE

Question. Do you think we can achieve the neutralization of South Vietnam so long as we are, or appear to be, losing the guerrilla warfare there?

Answer. It happened in Laos. It could possibly happen in Vietnam.

I concede that the prospects are dimmer if the war continues to go badly. There is much truth in General Clay's statement that nations can usually secure at the bargaining table only what they can hold in the field.

Question. Then you don't agree with the official position that to go to a neutralization formula at this point and withdraw American troops from South Vietnam would mean giving over South Vietnam to the Communists?

Answer. I am opposed to any bogus neutralization which is only a mask for a Communist takeover.

There are several neutral countries in that region that are not Communist. Laos and Cambodia are examples. In fact, I thought we had gotten over the habit of regarding neutralism as anti-American.

Where we are dealing with small countries on the fringes of China. If we insist on their taking sides in the cold war, they are very apt to feel compelled to take sides with China, and not with us. Neutralism becomes an umbrella which oftentimes can protect their independence.

NO GENEVA ACCORDS

Question. Then would you say the Geneva accords of 1962 on a neutral Laos are working?

Answer. I would say that it became obvious from the course of the fighting preceding that agreement that, without it, the whole of the country would soon have fallen under Communist control.

Question. Senator, do you find it either improper or awkward to have the U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, Henry Cabot Lodge, with a campaign being waged for the Republican presidential nomination in his behalf?

Answer. It may be awkward for him. I don't think it is awkward for the United States, as long as he attends to his duties as our Ambassador in Saigon.

Lodge is a man of great experience and ability. Mr. Kennedy's decision to send him to South Vietnam, and Mr. Johnson's decision to retain him there, seem to me to be in the best interests of the country.

I would just like to say one further word about this Vietnam problem.

President Kennedy was careful to make the distinction, some months ago, that the war in South Vietnam was their war, not ours. If their Government cannot maintain itself against the uprising, it won't be because we have failed to give it adequate advice, assistance, training, equipment, money, and materials. We will put enough armament and supplies into South Vietnam to fairly sink the peninsula before we are finished.

This enormous quantity of arms, food, and money had doubtlessly helped the Government, but our presence there may also be a handicap to the Government.

When one considers the general attitude of the Asian people toward Western nations, and how recently these countries have emerged from colonial control, it is hard to feature a war more difficult to win in that

region of the world than one carried on under the auspices of a Western nation.

I first went into this part of the world as a young officer in the Second World War, and I stayed for a time in India. Out in the countryside of India I never saw much distinction drawn between an American and an English uniform.

It is hard for me to believe that the people of Vietnam in the jungles and in the countryside draw the distinction we draw between American and French uniforms.

THE U.N. SESSIONS

Question. Senator, as head of the International Organizations Subcommittee, you must be concerned about what is going to happen in the next session of the United Nations.

Do you think, in view of French recognition of Communist China, it is wise policy for the United States to continue to oppose its admission to the United Nations?

Answer. I think it is necessary for us to continue to oppose the admission of Red China. I am doubtful that any change in our position, at this time, would prove beneficial to the United States. I suspect that China finds us a convenient enemy to have, and that, for internal purposes, she needs and wants an enemy.

Therefore, I am doubtful that any sudden change in our attitude would result in better behavior on the part of the Chinese Government.

Question. Do you think Red China will be admitted this year?

Answer. I am hopeful that Red China will not be admitted, despite the prospect that France may support her bid. However, we have to face the time when we may be outvoted on this issue. I only hope that, if it does happen, we will be mature enough to accept the decision of the member states on this question, and that we will continue, nevertheless, to remain a member of the United Nations, and to give it the support that its general record entitles it to have.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Question. What, then, should a responsible administration do to prepare this country and the people in this country for the prospect that you think is likely?

Answer. I think that we should begin to talk candidly about the realities in the world. To the extent that American policy is based upon myth, we deserve ourselves.

The fact is that there is a China, and that there is a Formosa. The fact is that Germany is divided into two parts. The power, the array of power, necessary to rejoin Germany, or to reinstate the Formosan Government in Peking, is simply not present. We are not prepared to supply it, nor should we, and neither are the other countries.

If we don't begin to recognize these facts, and take them into account as we formulate American policy, we are in danger of becoming a kind of Alice in Wonderland in world affairs, and other nations will begin to take policy away from us and make decisions which leave us behind.

That is what De Gaulle is now undertaking to do, with astonishing rashness, and with some prospect of success.

PRECEDENT IN LAOS

Question. It has been said that President Kennedy was much more personally involved in foreign policy than President Johnson. What would you say?

Answer. President Johnson is demonstrating, in his handling of the water-pipe crisis in Cuba and the dangerous Panamanian riots, that he is capable of acting with that combination of force and restraint which is the substance of statesmanship.

Nobody will walk over Lyndon Johnson. At the same time, he is going to be cool-headed in his decisions, if these examples

typify the way he intends to conduct American foreign policy as President of the United States.

Question. And yet, in answer to a previous question, you said that General de Gaulle was developing policies which seem to leave us behind. By "us," you seem to mean the administration which conducts foreign policy.

Answer. I was referring there to the whole American attitude, which has obtained under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and which, in the main, is still accepted on both sides of the aisle in Congress.

What I am calling for is a reappraisal of fundamental propositions that long have frozen American policy into place, both in Europe and in the Pacific.

President de Gaulle may force this reappraisal upon us, but it is much too early to say what posture President Johnson will assume with respect to these fundamental matters. He has been in the White House too short a period of time.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I find myself in somewhat the same situation as confronted me last Wednesday, when, after having sat in the Chamber all afternoon and into the early evening, in an effort to deliver what I thought was a constructive speech on the impact of title IV of the bill, the title which deals with education, I found myself without adequate time to go into that speech. I find that tonight I am in no different position. I have no intention of going into that principal speech at this time.

I thank Senators who have remained to see the day out with me. I wish to remark with a smile that the antifilibusterers filled up Wednesday afternoon talking about the Lord's Prayer and things in connection therewith, in a most interesting way, which we enjoyed, but which did not allow us to get down to a discussion of the civil rights problem.

This afternoon I find that the antifilibusterers have again consumed most of the afternoon—I believe more than four hours—in a discussion of the so-called Bobby Baker hearings, and various matters in connection therewith.

I am not complaining about that. I am perfectly willing to have Senators speak on any matters that they may wish to discuss. I do not believe that the philosophy of germaneness, so ardently espoused by my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is one of the Senators who has remained in the Senate Chamber this evening, applies in this kind of situation.

I believe I recalled to him, during the course of the debate on that new rule, that it would have no relation to any of the long discussions which take place over long periods of time when the Senate recesses from day to day.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. When the rule modification was suggested by the senior Senator from Rhode Island, he made it clear that it was not being employed as an implement to impede in any way the filibuster procedures of the Senate. It was designed merely to promote a little coherence and continuity and adherence to the business at hand for at least the small period of 3 hours immediately following the morning hour, once the unfinished business was laid down. It is unfortunate that this period is confined to only 3 hours. If it included a longer period of time we would not have had the situation about which my friend from Florida is complaining. Senators would have had to stick to the issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has made a real contribution, except that he has said the Senator from Florida is complaining of the situation. The Senator from Florida is not complaining. He is calling attention to the fact that on 2 days, when he understood he was scheduled to make what he regards as a major speech, he has been prevented from reaching it by long-winded discussions by Senators who usually preach long and loud against filibusters, and that he has just now, at a quarter to 8 o'clock in the evening, got around to a discussion of the pending business.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. With the presence of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us not forget the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is presiding, and the other distinguished Senators who have left the Chamber.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senators include the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PASTORE. And the Senator from Utah, who has come out of hiding.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been sitting in a comfortable seat in the rear of the Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wished the Record to show that there were five Senators present. Judging by the haste with which several other Senators left the Chamber a few minutes ago, I believe that if we went down to the Senate restaurant or some similar place we might find some of them taking refreshment there. I believe that is quite appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe that the least Senators can do is to remain in the Chamber and listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I was in the chair for a good part of the afternoon, and I noted the patience with which the Senator from Florida, who was scheduled to be the speaker this afternoon, yielded to one Senator after another, to speak on matters other than civil rights.

I was present last week, when I noted that the distinguished Senator from Florida was preparing to make his speech. Again he yielded to one Senator after another. In view of the courtesy which the Senator from Florida has exhibited, and which is so characteristic of him, it is only proper that some Senators remain in the Chamber to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend for those gracious remarks. I say to him, and for the Record, that I have found, in 18 years of service in the Senate, that patience is one of the virtues that should be cultivated; that if that virtue is wanting, there will be many occasions for ruffled feelings, which will never exist if there is an adequate amount of patience.

As I said, I have no intention of going into my principal remarks. First, as a basis for what I came here to say tonight, and also as a prolog to my main address, which will come later, I wish to say something about the experience I have had in this field. I do so humbly, and only because I feel that I am in a position to make some comments based upon real experience in connection with the bi-racial problem, particularly with the educational features of that problem.

As a young man in my home State of Florida, I served for a good while as chairman of the local school board. In my hometown, where about 33 percent or 35 percent of the citizens are colored people, many of them very fine people, many of them my lifelong friends, I found that their needs were acute. Therefore, when we began a new program for the construction of new schools for the schoolchildren of that community, there was included a 14-room brick building, as the beginning of an adequate school facility for the colored children of that community.

At that time, it took care of the colored children of that community. It still stands. It is the center of the community life of the colored part of our community. It stands in their principal residential area, where it should stand. It has now been enlarged to include not only the brick buildings, but also a quite large athletic facility, a fairly large agricultural proving ground or experimental field, and a swimming pool which is vastly better than the one we have provided for the white children, the reason for that being, of course, that it was built later than the one at the white school. Also, there are other facilities which are comparable to those which can be found anywhere.

In that early experience, I found that the Negro citizens reacted with great joy to the chance to get good school

facilities and have them followed by good school operations, which we have provided for years in that town. I have gained the impression that the things that the Negro citizens wanted most of all were good facilities and good schools. That was the principal part of the problem.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In many ways, my experience runs along the same line as that of the distinguished Senator from Florida. He was a distinguished Governor of his great State. It was my privilege to serve as Governor of my State. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore), who is in the Chamber, was Governor of his State. Without question, the problem of education was the knottiest that occupied our attention. Also, this is a field that concerned me when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. So we discuss these matters against a background of experience.

Now, let me ask is it not true that in many sections of the country—and this is true not only in the southern section of the country—the Negro schools, schools which Negroes usually attend, have been inferior to the school systems attended exclusively or predominantly by white students?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Connecticut is correct. His statement is true with respect to my part of the country. It is true of his part of the country. It is true of every large city of the country. I shall deal with that question rather fully in the principal address which I hope to make within the next few days. At this time, I simply confirm what the distinguished Senator has said.

Schools for Negroes and others having modest means, who live in the slums of the great cities, have customarily been substandard and inferior. I expect to quote in some detail from the book written by Dr. Conant, a former president of Harvard, who has put his finger upon this as the principal problem—that it is necessary to have better facilities, better operations, and better teachers, and it is necessary to spend much more money on the operations of public schools and the construction of public schools in the crowded tenement areas of the great cities, whether they be in the North or South. That does not end the problem, but it is one of the gravest of all the aspects of the problem. I hope the Senator will allow me to dwell upon that at more detail at my later appearance.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida will notify me when he makes that speech, because it is a subject in which I am vitally interested. I assume he refers to Dr. Conant's book entitled "Slums and Suburbs."

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Connecticut is correct. I have one of the original copies of that book. I spoke about it at some length 2 years ago. I do not mean that I spoke exhaustively about it, but I placed many quotations from it in the record of the debate

which we were having at that time in the field of civil rights. I expect to do the same thing again, or perhaps to amplify upon my earlier statement. I expect also to supplement the statements by Dr. Conant with the statements of several others in the field of education in the northern part of the Nation, because their comments in the main are quite like his in this field.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I found during my work as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that one of the problems that required the most help was the need to improve education in the large cities of America. I remember returning from a trip across the country, after Congress had adjourned, while I was Secretary, and finding to my great dismay what had to be done in the large cities of America. I submitted a bill the following year which would have provided \$50 million for special efforts to improve educational opportunities in urban areas. As happens with most educational bills, that bill never saw the light of day.

What appeals to me in title IV, and what I should think would appeal to the distinguished Senator from Florida, instead of meriting criticism, is that the provisions of title IV allow the Commissioner of Education to give technical assistance and make grants to school districts where desegregation problems are being resolved. This assistance can be of great help, especially in some of our urban school districts. So I look upon title IV of the bill as rather a boon for all phases of education, and not as something to be condemned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I must say that the technical assistance section is practically the only part of title IV of which I could approve wholeheartedly. To the proposal for open-ended appropriations for the purpose of bringing to an average the facilities in those great areas of the Nation, which would certainly cost billions of dollars to accomplish, the Senator from Florida objects. The Senator from Florida objects even more to the provision of the bill which would give unbridled authority to the Attorney General to use the injunctive process in his sole discretion, coupled with the right to use the criminal contempt procedure without jury trial. To that I strongly object.

Such a drastic remedy is always subject to a careful check as to where it should be used or where it should be permitted. But when it is proposed to permit it in so intimate a field, touching so closely the lives of our people as the public school system does, and where it opens up the vista of hundreds of perhaps thousands of suits to speed a desegregation policy that has not worked at all, or as was envisaged by friends of desegregation 10 years ago, I object to it. However, I do not expect to discuss that aspect of the subject in detail at this time. I simply say that I think the proposal to render technical assistance, which was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, is perhaps the only part of title IV which is good. So the Senator has pierced my armor with his comment. I am only sorry that title IV is not presented as a